

15843

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9 and 15 are amended, and Claims 4 and 12 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-20, as amended remain in the application.

No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

In the Office Action dated July 1, 2004, the Examiner objected to "Claim 5" because in Claim 15, line 6, it appears as if the term "attached" should be inserted after holder portion.

Applicants believe that the objection is to Claim 15. Applicants amended Claim 15 accordingly and amended Claim 9 in a similar manner.

The Examiner rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. According to the Examiner, the phrase "a pair of side portions extending from the said front portion" is not descriptive of the invention described in the specification and/or the drawings since the side portions extend from the holder portion.

Applicants agree with the Examiner and amended Claim 9 accordingly.

The Examiner rejected Claims 9 (as best understood), 10, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 2,515,887 issued to Moore.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore, in view of Volkert et al. The Volkert et al. patent was not identified by patent number, nor was a copy provided. During a telephone interview today, the Examiner identified the Volkert et al. reference as U.S. Patent No. 6,044,490.

The Examiner objected to Claims 4 and 12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants amended Claim 1 to include the subject matter of cancelled Claim 4 and amended Claim 9 to include the subject matter of cancelled Claim 12.

The Examiner allowed Claims 15-20.

The Examiner cited the U.S. Patent No. 1,563,687 issued to Chaney; the U.S. Patent No. 2,755,582 issued to Nichols; the U.S. Patent No. 4,579,232 issued to Fedak; and the U.S. Patent No. 4,819,792 issued to Christian. Applicants reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in his rejections.

15843

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.